

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claim 26 is added herein. Support for new claim 26 may be found in the claims as originally filed. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,999,971 to Buckland (hereinafter “Buckland”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0097361 to Huang et al. (hereinafter “Huang”). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

The Office Action acknowledges at page 3 that Buckland shows no “extracting a hyperlink title and a URL of an individual storage location based on the received identification information and the registered authorized user information and generating a document containing a hyperlink including the extracted hyperlink title wherein hyperlink to the extracted URL of the individual storage location is defined.” The Office Action proposes to compensate for this deficiency by combining Buckland with Huang, asserting at page 3 that:

It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Buckland by the reaching of Huang et al., because extracting an HP title and a URL of an individual storage location based on the received identification information and the registered authorized user information; and generating a document containing a hyperlink including the extracted HP title wherein hyperlink to the extracted URL of the individual storage location is defined, would enable the disclosing method to be more secure, because disclosing two types of browser information, one that has information open to the public and another that is kept secret from the public, provides the mechanism for the right user to access that information.

Huang, however, does not appear to show these limitations either. Neither Buckland nor Huang, in particular, need any “authorized user information,” as recited in claim 1, at all. The Office Action appears to be analogizing cookies to authorized user information. Although cookies, do, in a sense, identify a user, they have nothing to do with whether the user is *authorized* to use any particular system.

Furthermore, modifying Buckland as proposed by the Office Action would change the principle of operation of Buckland. Modifications that change the principle of operation of a reference are prohibited by M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. In particular, in Buckland, “If it is determined that the client does not include the first site data block, then the control site is controlled to produce a control site data block having both control site identification data and a client identifier,” as

described at column 2, lines 20-24. Thus, if an *unidentified* client tries to access a network site in Buckland, the system *provides* the user with an identifier. Buckland, thus, does not appear to be particular about whether the user is authorized or not, merely whether the user has been identified. This is exactly the opposite of the claimed invention, which checks for “authorized user information,” before authorizing a user to browse the browsable information.

Claim 1, in particular, recites:

Authorized user information of a user authorized to browse the browsable information.

Neither Buckland nor Huang teach, disclose, or suggest, “authorized user information of a user authorized to browse the browsable information,” as recited in claim 1. As Buckland, rather, describes in the Abstract, a client identifier is *supplied* to an unidentified client:

If it is determined that the client does not include the first site data block, then the control site is controlled to produce a control site data block having both control site identification data and a client identifier. The control site data block then is transmitted from the control site to the client.

Therefore, Buckland, far from worrying about whether a user is authorized to browse information, actually provides the user with identification on the fly.

Huang, for its part, does not bother to identify a user at all, let alone consider whether the user is authorized. As Huang, rather, describes in the Abstract:

A message center based desktop organizational and management system that includes a set of applications centered around and integrated with a message center.

There is little doubt that a user will be authorized to access their own desk top. Thus, neither Buckland nor Huang need any “authorized user information”, let alone “extracting a hyperlink title and a URL of an individual storage location based on the received identification information and the registered authorized user information and generating a document containing a hyperlink including the extracted hyperlink title wherein hyperlink to the extracted URL of the individual storage location is defined,” as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Buckland were combined with Huang the claimed invention would not result. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 2 and 3 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 3 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 4-13:

Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 recite:

Authorized user information of a user authorized to browse the browsable information.

Neither Buckland nor Huang teach, disclose, or suggest, "authorized user information of a user authorized to browse the browsable information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 are submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13 depend from claims 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12, respectively, and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 14-17:

Claim 14 recites:

Authorized user information.

Neither Buckland nor Huang teach, disclose, or suggest, "authorized user information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 14 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 15, 16, and 17 depend from claim 14 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 15, 16, and 17 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 16, and 17 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 18-21:

Claim 18 recites:

Authorized user information.

Neither Buckland nor Huang teach, disclose, or suggest, "authorized user information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 18 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 19, 20, and 21 depend from claim 18 and add additional distinguishing elements.

Claims 19, 20, and 21 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19, 20, and 21 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 22-25:

Claim 22 recites:

Authorized user information.

Neither Buckland nor Huang teach, disclose, or suggest, "authorized user information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 22 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 23, 24, and 25 depend from claim 22 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 23, 24, and 25 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23, 24, and 25 is earnestly solicited.

New Claim 26:

Claim 26 recites:

Registering a headline and authorized user information with a storage location.

None of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest registering a headline and authorized user information with a storage location, as recited in claim 26. Claim 26 is thus believed to be allowable.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1-26 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1-26 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/026,458

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:

Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

Date: 20 0805

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501